

REMARKS

Status of Application

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 10-11, 14, 18-26 and 29-35 are all the claims pending in the application.¹

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 10-11, 14 and 18-26 have been rejected.

Formalities

Applicant again respectfully reminds the Examiner that he has not provided a signed Form 1449 (SB08) for the IDS submitted on March 14, 2008. Applicant again respectfully requests that the Examiner kindly indicate that the IDS has been considered by providing a signed Form 1449 (SB08) with the next office action.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claims 10, 20, 21, 14, 24, 26, 22 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action. Since the rejections of claims 10, 20, 21, 14, 24, 26, 22 and 11 have been addressed, as set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10, 20, 21, 14, 24, 26, 22 and 11 are immediately allowable.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 29 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner hold in abeyance such rewriting until

¹ The Office Action Summary for the 02/04/2010 Office Action erroneously indicates that claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 18-26 and 29 are all the claims pending in the application.

the Examiner has reconsidered the patentability of claim 3 in light of the reasons presented below.

Finally, the 02/04/2010 Office Action does not set forth any grounds of rejection for claims 30-35 and, therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 30-35 are immediately allowable.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14 and 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As an initial matter, Applicant notes that claim 8 was previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and, therefore, the Examiner's rejection of claim 8 is improper.

Further, the 02/04/2010 Office Action does not set forth any grounds of rejection for claims 20, 24 or 25 and, therefore, the Examiner's rejection of claims 20, 24 or 25 are also improper.

Without conceding to the merits of the Examiner's rejections, claims 1-3, 6-7, 10-11, 21-23 and 25 have been amended, as set forth above. In view of the above amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the Examiner's rejections are now moot.

Claim Rejection 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Seno et al. (US. 6,924,679). Applicant respectfully traverses all of these rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Without conceding to the merits of the Examiner's rejections, claim 1 has been amended, as set forth above, to recite (among other things):

...a clock distribution circuit comprising:

at least one first block receiving a variable supply voltage, said at least one first block receiving a clock signal;

at least one second block receiving the variable supply voltage; and

at least one variable delay circuit which generates a delayed clock signal by ~~provides~~ providing a delay in the clock signal received by the at least one first block, said delay changing in accordance with a change in the variable supply voltage provided to the at least one first block;

wherein the clock signal received by the at least one first block is different from ~~a~~ the delayed clock signal received by the at least one second block.

Applicant respectfully submits that Seno fails to teach or suggest all of the above features and, therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Seno for at least these reasons.

For instance, claim 1 is directed to a clock distribution circuit. In sharp contrast to claim 1, Seno is directed to monitoring technology for controlling power voltage. However, Seno provides no teaching or suggestion regarding a clock distribution circuit aimed at preventing

clock skew, as recited in claim 1. Indeed, according to FIG. 7 of Seno, which is relied upon by the grounds of rejection, an output of the LSI is not used as a clock signal. Therefore, Seno does not teach or suggest a clock distribution circuit as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over Seno for at least these reasons. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claim 2 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1.

In view of the similarity between the requirements of claims 3 and 25 and the requirements of claim 1, already discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3 and 25 are patentable over Seno for at least reasons similar to those already discussed above, as well as the additionally recited features therein.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all of these rejections.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seno et al. (US. 6,924,679) in view of Masleid (2008/0303600). Applicant respectfully traverses all of these rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Dependent claims 18 and 19 incorporate all the novel and nonobvious features of their respective base claim 1. For at least the reasons already discussed above, Seno fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 1. Further, Masleid fails to remedy the deficient teachings of

Seno. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 18 and 19 are patentable over the cited references at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all of these rejections.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Andrew J. Taska /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Andrew J. Taska
Registration No. 54,666

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 4, 2010